AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWING

Please accept Replacement Sheet 1A, which contains Figure 1.

REMARKS

The following remarks are in response to the Office Actions of August 15, 2007 and of May 01, 2007. Reconsideration and allowance of Applicant's claims are respectfully requested. Claims 10 and 13-17 are pending in this application. Claim 10 has been amended, and claims 13-17 are new. As would be explained in detail below, applicants respectfully submit that all claims are allowable over the prior art.

Although no fee is believed to be due in association with the instant response to the Office Action, the USPTO is authorized to charge any required fees to Deposit Account 50-0958.

Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (37 CFR 1.121)

In the Office Action of August 15, 2007, the USPTO mailed a Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment because claim 10 of Applicant's amendment response included an incorrect status identifier. Thus, Applicant's July 30th amendment response was not entered. In response to the August 15 Office Action, Applicant files this present paper, in which claim 10 has been properly identified by the identifier "currently amended." Applicant believes that the present paper now conforms to the formal requirements, and respectfully requests that the entry of the present paper.

Drawings

Replacement Sheet 1A has been provided. The replacement sheet corrects an inadvertent error in the original drawings, wherein element 60 was *called* an "OIL CONTOUR MONITOR." As outlined in paragraph [0015] of the original disclosure,

element 60 is an "oil content monitor." The replacement drawing corrects this error. No new matter has been added.

Abstract

On page 2 of the Non-Final Office Action of May 01 2007, the Examiner objects to the abstract of disclosure because of the inclusion of legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "consist of" recited in the second line from the bottom. Applicant respectfully submits that as originally presented, it is clear that the language did not bear the legal limitations as when used in claims. However, in an effort to advance the prosecution of the present application, Applicant has removed the offending language.

35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph Rejections

In the Non-Final Office Action of May 01, 2007, claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. With respect to claim 10, the Examiner states that the language "condensate distillate" is redundant. In response to the Examiner's rejection, Applicant has deleted the language "condensate distillate" from the text.

Also in claim 10, the Examiner states that "heating" as recited in line 2 should be changed to "preheating" because there is further heating in the clash chamber. Applicant respectfully disagrees. It is the Applicant's position that in the outlined process, each occurrence of heating is aptly described by the term "heating" and no change is

necessary. Regarding claim 11, the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. § 112 objection is now moot because Applicant has canceled claim 11.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a), Prior Art Rejections

In the Non-final Office Action of May 01, 2007, the Examiner states, "Claims *1-12* are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Hayashi et al (4,953,694) in view of Sephton and with or without Hamilton, Jr. (3,572,588)." [Emphasis added.] Because claims 1-9 were previously cancelled, Applicant assumes that the Examiner meant claims *10-12*, as opposed to Claims *1-12* as written.

Applicant respectfully submits that the amended independent claim 10 is allowable over the prior art. As amended, claim 10 recites, a method in a system having, *inter alia*, "a heat absorbing coil within the bottom section of the flash chamber." The prior art, taken singly or combined, do not teach or suggest a method in a system as recited. None of the references to Hayashi, Sephton, and Hamilton, teach a heat absorbing coil in the bottom section of a flash chamber. For this reason, Applicant's method is allowable over the prior art.

Additionally, claim 10 recites, inter alia, "passing the wastewater through the heat absorbing coil within the bottom section of the flash chamber," and "feeding the wastewater from the heat absorbing coil to the condenser." As outlined above, none of Hayashi, Sephton, and Hamilton, teach a heat absorbing coil in the bottom section of a flash chamber. Consequently, none of the above-cited references teaches the steps of passing the wastewater through the heat absorbing coil and feeding the wastewater from

the heat absorbing coil to a condenser. Because the prior art does not teach or suggest any of the recited steps, Applicant invention is allowable over the prior art.

It should be noted that Applicant's invention is directed to a method of processing wastewater, wherein contaminants are separated from the wastewater. According to the method, the wastewater is injected through an entry orifice into a flash chamber where conditions are manipulated to enable the evaporation of the wastewater. When the wastewater evaporates, the majority of the contaminants do not evaporate. Instead, the contaminants settle at the bottom section of the flash chamber. As illustrated in Figure 1, and as outlined in paragraph 10 of the specification, prior to the injection of the wastewater through the orifice, the wastewater is passed through a heat absorbing coil located in the flash chamber, to heat up the wastewater. Subsequently, the wastewater is pumped through a condenser and a heat exchanger, external to the flash chamber, where the wastewater is further heated prior to being injected. Therefore, Applicant's method includes the feeding of the wastewater to the flash chamber on at least two separate occasions. The claimed method steps of feeding the wastewater to the chamber *on two separate occasions*, which maximizes efficiencies, are not taught or suggested by the prior art. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 10 is allowable over the prior art.

Claims 13-17, which depend from independent claim 10, are also allowable over Hayashi, Sephton, and Hamilton, because they incorporate the limitations of claim 10. Furthermore, claims 13-17 add additional elements that further distinguish the prior art.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application, withdrawal of all rejections, and the timely allowance of all pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 09/05/07

Dave A. Ghatt
Reg. No. 50,926

Customer No. 38092
Office of Counsel (Patents)
Naval Surface Warfare Center
Carderock Division
Code 004
9500 MacArthur Blvd.
West Bethesda, MD 20817-5700

(301) 227-1835